

# EXHIBIT D

Message

---

**From:** Moira Donegan [REDACTED]  
**on behalf of** Moira Donegan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10/11/2017 4:41:40 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: list

Yeah, I've been struggling with this too. A lot of people have described to me, for instance, [REDACTED]'s specific pattern of \*suggesting\* that you fuck him and then immediately \*suggesting\* that he can also get you a job—not quid pro quo, but quid pro quo adjacent. I'm inclined to have people write that stuff down, to be honest, because this shit can matter and I'm not down with encouraging women to feel bad for not suffering *enough*.

On the other hand, [REDACTED] told me about a similar attempt by poet women to catalog poet men a couple years back that collapsed under the weight of personal vendettas. People with axes to grind against their shitty ex boyfriends, people out to protect boyfriends or friends who were nice to them but predators to others. It's dicey.

Basically I would tell people to include anything that made them feel uncomfortable or unsafe, and to only highlight in red men who have been physically violent.

On Wed, Oct 11, 2017 at 4:31 PM, [REDACTED] looks pretty damn accurate to me. I know a couple people who are thinking about adding but don't know if their issue qualifies as "that bad" . . . do you think it's worth adding a note in the doc about criteria for inclusion (or deletion, if everyone can edit)? I think there are plenty of sleazes or creeps who are not abusive but not institutional (i.e. writers), so their sleaziness/creepiness is more diffuse. But maybe creep / sleaze only warrant inclusion on this list if it's in an institutional context when you really can't be that way?